UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/591,918	06/09/2000	Stefanos Kaxiras	2-2	3479

7590 04/06/2004

EXAMINER
GOSSAGE, GLENN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2187	10

Joseph B Ryan
Ryan & Mason LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/591,918	KAXIRAS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Glenn Gossage	2187	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 January 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *14 January 2004* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it does not enable one to quickly determine from a cursory inspection the nature and gist of the technical disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b).

In this regard, applicant's arguments filed January 14, 2004 have been considered but are not persuasive.

Although the response indicates that the "abstract (has) been amended in a manner that is believed to overcome the associated objections raised by the Examiner" (response at page 12), this issue was not addressed at all, by way of either amendment or argument. Moreover, applicant appears to have simply deleted more than half the abstract without any regard to the content, and the abstract omits many claimed and disclosed features (the abstract being an abstract of the disclosure). Note that the abstract as currently written essentially reflects claim 1 and one of its dependent claims (claim 2), yet there are nineteen other claims dependent, directly of indirectly, from claim 1 alone and many of the disclosed features of the present invention are not mentioned at all.

The following changes are again suggested to overcome the objections to the abstract. Initially, it appears an introductory sentence such as --A multiprocessor system, apparatus and method for determining a set of predicted readers of a data block in a shared-memory multiprocessor system, are disclosed.-- should be inserted before "A set" in line 1 for clarity and completeness (note claims 1 and 22, lines 1-2 and

claim 28, line 1, e.g.). Also, it appears "A" in line 1 (page line 2) should then be changed to --The--.

Additionally, in line 1, delete "are determined." In lines 1-3, change "in a shared ... predicted readers based on the" to simply --is generated based on a--. In line 5, change "In ..., the" to simply --The--, and change "are" to --may be--. In line 6, after "function" insert -- , such as a union, intersection or pattern-based function, --. In line 7, (re)insert sentences such as --The global history may comprise multiple sets of previous readers, with the total number of sets corresponding to a designated history depth. The prediction process may also use a designated subset of cache address information, processor node identification or ID information, or program counter information.--.

It is believed these changes result in an abstract that is substantially the same in content as the original abstract, while remaining under the newer 150 word or 15 line limit.

Appropriate correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

2. The proposed substitute sheets of drawings filed January 14, 2004 have been disapproved by the Examiner. The proposed substitute sheets of drawings do not address many of the drawing objections made by the Examiner.

For example, the drawings are objected to because in Figures 1 and 2, it appears "NI" within "boxes" 104A-C should be changed to --Net. I/F-- or --Network I/F-- for clarity

(since the acronym or abbreviation "NI" does not appear to be "well known" or commonly used in the art).

In Figure 4, the wording "processors in the set {a, b, c}" is somewhat confusing. It appears "processors in the set {a, b, c}" should be changed to --processors in the set of nodes {a, b, c}-- for clarity and consistency (see page 7, lines 5-6, e.g.).

In Figure 5, within step or "box" 202, it appears --current-- should be inserted before "readers" for clarity and consistency (see page 7, line 15). In step or "box" 216, the wording "predicts a function" is unclear and confusing (in this regard, also see the objection below with respect to page 7, line 24). It appears "predicts a function of the sets" should be changed to --predicts a set of readers-- (see page 9, lines 8-12 as well as the wording in step or "box" 224), and "(intersect or union)" changed to --(intersection or union function)-- (see page 8, line 7, e.g.), for clarity and consistency.

In this regard, applicant's arguments filed January 14, 2004 have been considered but are not persuasive.

The argument that "the ... format is the one which Applicants have chosen to use," and thus is not objectionable, is not persuasive since Applicant is not free to use any "format" which he or she chooses. The drawings must be clear and consistent with the specification to avoid confusion. For example, in Figure 5, the label "Directory Invalidates Readers" within step or block 202 is confusing, as this language indicates all readers (current, previous or predicted) are invalidated while the specification indicates

that current readers are invalidated (see page 7, line 15). Similarly, the wording "predicts a function" in step or "box" 216 is unclear and confusing since it does not appear a "function" (union or intersection) is predicted (it appears a set of readers is predicted, not a "function").

With respect to Figure 4, while "shorthand" notation may be used where the "shorthand" notation is clear, the wording "processors in the set {a,b,c}" is confusing since it appears the set is made up of processors, not nodes as described in the specification. Thus, the "shorthand" notation chosen by Applicants is confusing and misleading.

[It is believed "NI" in Figures 1 and 2 should also be written out for clarity for clarity since the acronym or abbreviation "NI" does not appear to be "well known" or commonly used in the art. This issue is not critical given the explanation in the specification, however, and applicant may .]

Applicant is REQUIRED to submit a proposed drawing correction in response to this Office action. However, actual formal correction of the noted defect(s) (submission of corrected formal drawings, e.g.) can be deferred until the application is allowed by the examiner.

Also note MPEP 608.02(r) and (v).

3 It is once again noted that the disclosure has not been checked by the Examiner to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's

cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the disclosure. The following objections are specifically noted:

In the specification:

On page 7, line 5, line 24, the language "predicts a function" is confusing as it does not appear a "function" is predicted here. It appears "function of the sets" should be changed to --set of predicted readers-- for clarity and consistency (see page 9, lines 8-12, e.g.). Also, it appears --function or-- should be inserted after "union" in line 25 for clarity and consistency (note page 8, line 7 of the original specification, e.g.).

On page 8, line 29, it appears --of nodes-- should be inserted after "set" for clarity and consistency (note the change made in the paragraph starting on page 7, line 3, at lines 3-4 of the paragraph, e.g.).

Also, the changes made in the paragraphs starting on lines 21 and 26 of page 12 and line 1 of page 13, without explanation, are confusing and may constitute NEW MATTER. It appears the paragraphs should be rewritten to reflect the language of the original specification to avoid possible questions of new matter, with an explanatory sentence or phrase defining "expensive" in this context (how this relates to the "sensitivity," e.g.).

Again note that these are merely exemplary. The entire specification should be carefully and completely reviewed to ensure that all possible errors are located and corrected.

Appropriate correction is required.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in-
> (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
> (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

Claims 1-4, 10, 21-25, 28-31 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kaxiras ("Identification and Optimization ... Shared-Memory Multiprocessors").

With respect to claim 1, as well as claims 22 and 28, Kaxiras discloses a method and apparatus for determining a set of predicted readers of a data block in a multiprocessor system, the method including determining a current set of readers of a data block which is subject to a write request [Kaxiras teaches determining and collecting the identities of current "consumers" in a temporary bitmap (see pages 206-207, e.g.). Kaxiras discusses an SCI protocol as well as other directory based cache coherent protocols in which the directory itself keeps track of consumers using a full bitmap]. Kaxiras also

teaches generating a set of predicted readers or consumers based on the current set of readers in the temporary bitmap and at least one additional set of readers representative of at least a portion of a global history of a directory associated with the data block [Kaxiras teaches that a set of predicted consumers or readers may be generated from the logical AND or intersection of the temporary bit map and a predictor bit-map. This "intersection prediction" predicts the intersection of the last two sets of consumers to be the new set of consumers or readers.) Again note that Kaxiras discusses an SCI protocol as well as other directory based cache coherent protocols in which the directory itself keeps track of consumers using a full bitmap].

With respect to claims 2-3, as well as claims 23-24 and 29-30, Kaxiras teaches applying a "function" such as an intersection or logical AND function to the current set of readers and at least one additional set of readers (again see pages 206-207).

With respect to claim 4, as well as claims 25 and 31, Kaxiras teaches that the directory and the data block comprise elements of a memory associated with a processor node of the multiprocessor system.

With respect to claim 10, Kaxiras also teaches sending the resulting data block to each of the readers in the set of predicted readers [Kaxiras teaches speculatively "pre-sending" the data block to each of the predicted "readers" or consumers (see pages 208-209, e.g.).]

With respect to claim 21, as well as claim 34, Kaxiras teaches that a "subset" of the readers such as one reader corresponds to a particular processor node in the multiprocessor system (a bit in a bit map may be used for each of the processors).

In this regard, applicant's arguments filed January 14, 2004 have been considered but are not persuasive.

The Examiner maintains that the claims as broadly written are met by the reference. It is important to note that the claims only recite that the set of predicted readers is generated based on "at least a portion" of a global history. Kaxiras teaches that a set of predicted consumers or readers may be generated from the logical AND or intersection of the temporary bit map and a predictor bit-map, and that this "intersection prediction" predicts the intersection of the last two sets of consumers to be the new set of consumers or readers.). Information regarding the sets of different consumers may be considered to represent a "global history," and thus it would appear "at least a portion of" a global history is used in generating the set of predicted readers

5. Claims 5-7, 11-20, 26-27 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaxiras.

With respect to claim 5, as well as claims 26 and 32, Kaxiras discloses a method of determining a set of predicted readers of a data block in a multiprocessor system including generating a set of predicted readers or consumers based on at least two sets of consumers including a current set of consumers or readers and a previous set of consumers or readers, but does not teach that the history information comprise a plurality of sets of previous readers processed by the directory. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that maintaining more than one set of

previous readers in the history information allows one to better track the history of the previous readers or consumers and improve the prediction ability of the prediction scheme. Accordingly, it would have been readily obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to store of a plurality of sets of previous readers in the history information of Kaxiras in order to improve the prediction ability and thereby improve system performance by more accurately predicting where to "pre-send" information.

With respect to claim 6, as well as claims 27 and 33, Kaxiras teaches that the prediction is made using sets of consumers such as the last two sets of consumers. As the sets of consumers change, the dynamic prediction scheme will apply a "function" to the previous two sets of consumers and different sets of consumers will replace the sets as new consumers sets are formed, i.e. the set of predicted consumers is not cumulative but it changes dynamically. Since the last two sets are used, the set previous in time to the last two sets will no longer be used and will be replaced or "shifted" out as time progresses. Thus, the global history may be considered to be maintained in a shift register having a number of storage locations corresponding to a designated history depth.

With respect to claim 7, as discussed above with respect to claim 5, the history depth may obviously be changed depending on the number of previous sets of consumers maintained and the desired degree of accuracy of the prediction scheme and the selection of a particular number of sets of previous consumers such as three or more sets would have been readily obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

claimed invention was made and, as such, does not render the claimed invention patentably distinct.

With respect to claim 13, as well as claims 14-17, Kaxiras discloses a method of determining a set of predicted readers of a data block in a multiprocessor system including generating a set of predicted readers or consumers based on at least two sets of consumers including a current set of consumers or readers and a previous set of consumers or readers, but does not teach that the function may be selected dynamically. While Kaxiras specifically only discusses an "intersection" or logical function, those of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that other logical operations or functions such as a logical OR (union) function may also be used depending on the bandwidth available and capacities of the memories. Kaxiras teaches that the prediction scheme should be dynamic so as to maintain optimum performance and the selection of a particular logic function dynamically such as on a per program or per page basis in order to optimize performance based on available bandwidth and other system considerations would have been readily obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art a the time the claimed invention was made.

With respect to claims 11 and 12, the selection of a particular update mechanism in order to optimize system performance would have been further readily obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

With respect to claims 18-20, Kaxiras teaches utilizing a hybrid prediction scheme and that protocols in which the directory is an excellent source of information about the consumers and the selection of particular types of information such as a subset of

cache address information, processor node information and program counter information in order to optimize the hybrid prediction scheme would have been further readily obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made and does not patentably define the claimed invention over the prior art.

6. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaxiras in view of Islam et al.

With respect to claims 8 and 9, Kaxiras discloses a method of determining a set of predicted readers of a data block in a multiprocessor system including generating a set of predicted readers or consumers based on at least two sets of consumers including a current set of consumers or readers and a previous set of consumers or readers, but does not teach maintaining an "accessed bit" for each of a plurality of data blocks, the accessed bit of a particular reader for a given data block indicating whether the particular reader has actually read the given data block.

Islam et al also discloses a shared memory multiprocessor system and teaches maintaining an "accessed bit" for each of a plurality of data blocks, the accessed bit of a particular reader for a given data block indicating whether the particular reader has actually read the given data block (see column 3, lines 44-47 and Figure 1b, e.g.). In this manner, feedback is provided as to whether the data block is actually being accessed so that the performance of the system such as a cache placement/replacement scheme may be tuned or optimized (by monitoring whether a

data block put in a cache is actually accessed, better placement/replacement decisions may be made).

Accordingly, it would have been readily obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to maintain an "accessed bit" for each of a plurality of data blocks, as taught by Islam et al, in the shared-memory multiprocessor system of Kaxiras, in order to obtain feedback on the actual use of the data and thereby improve system performance.

With respect to claim 9, it would have been obvious to send the accessed bit information with other status information such as validity/invalidity information so as to reduce the amount coherence traffic.

7. Applicant's arguments filed January 14, 2004 have been considered but are not persuasive. It is believed applicant's arguments have been addressed in the preceding paragraphs (note particularly numbered paragraphs 1, 2 and 4).

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenn Gossage whose telephone number is (703) 305-3820.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald Sparks can be reached on (703) 308-1756.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 (After Final Communications)
(703) 746-7239 (Official Communications)

(703) 746-5713 (Use this FAX number only after approval by the Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "DRAFT" communications. An Examiner may request that a formal paper/amendment be faxed directly to him or her on occasion.)

GLENN GOSSAGE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2187